Mr. B. S. SIDDAPPA.—With reference to the answer to question (*g*), will the Government be pleased to state exactly when the work will be taken on hand?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—As soon as possible.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA.—The District Board has also resolved to bear its share of expenditure if the scheme is sanctioned. In that view will the Government please expedite sanction to the scheme?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—Very well.

Q.—66. **Lokasevaparayane D. SAKAMMA (Women's Interest).**—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) the number of lady representatives in the several public bodies?

(*b*) the percentage they bear to the women population of the State?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, LAW DEPARTMENT (Mr. C. Subrahmanya Aiyar).**—

(*a*) (i) Representative Assembly		6
(ii) School Boards	...	9
(iii) Village Panchayats	...	2
(iv) Municipal Councils	...	6
(v) District Boards	...	9
(vi) Senate	...	5
Total	...	37

(*b*) 37 out of population of 3,203,339 according to the census of 1931.

Lokasevaparayane D. SAKAMMA.—The total women population of the State is 23 lakhs. There is not even one representative of theirs on the Legislative Council.

The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Rajasevaprasaktha (B. T. Kesavaiengar).—The question of giving them representation in the Legislative Council, if possible, is under consideration.

Lokasevaparayane D. SAKAMMA.—In giving representation to special interests, will the Government be pleased to consider the case of village interests also?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—So long as there are qualified representatives, it is the same whether they come from villages or towns. The suggestion will however be considered at the time of framing rules.

REPRESENTATIONS—*concld.*

No. 75: Re-valuation of answer papers of the University Examinations—concld.

At this stage, **Mr. K. MARULAPPA** sought permission of the Chair to make a submission with reference to Representation No. 75 already discussed on the fifth day.

He said that there were many poor boys who daily went from door to door in quest of food, and managed, with a great deal of difficulty, to prosecute their studies in the colleges. And they would naturally be very much upset if they did not pass in the University examinations. Some of them were intelligent and hard-working students and might have reasonable hope of securing a pass if their papers were re-valued. After all, it was only those who were confident of having done well in the examination that would ask for re-valuation. He therefore prayed that a provision be made in the University Act to the effect that answer papers might be re-valued on application and deposit of a prescribed fee.

The PRESIDENT promised that the representation would be considered.

RESOLUTIONS.

Resolution No. 5.

Raising the Weirs of Tanks.

Mr. S. RAMAPPA moved the following resolution:—

"This Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that, as several tanks are silted up and their capacity is reduced, the question of raising the weirs of the tanks in one series be investigated and, if advisable, the work be taken up."

He stated that Government had already been doing a lot in the direction of restoring major and minor tanks, but in many cases, due to accumulation of silt, the capacity of tanks was going down every year. If at least the waste

weirs were raised in all such cases, the capacity of the tanks would improve. At present, the *atchkat* lands were not receiving adequate water supply, and some of them were receiving no supply whatever. Since crops could not be realised on this account, the raiyats were suffering losses; and since remissions had to be given in such cases, the Government also were forgoing revenue. If the present state of things were to continue for some more time, the speaker was afraid that the tanks themselves would go out of existence altogether. The Government would have to spend huge sums of money if they wanted to restore those tanks at any time in the future. He therefore requested the Government to get prepared a list of all the tanks to be restored, and also an urgent programme of restoration of such tanks and execute the works in accordance with such programme.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMY IYER seconded the resolution. In doing so he referred to a certain programme of restoration of tanks which had been prepared by Mr. Kensington, K.E., about 50 or 60 years ago. That Engineer, he said, had prepared a list showing the exact *atchkat* under each tank. But the population having since increased, the demand for land had increased correspondingly and the Revenue Department was disposing of darkhast applications without consulting the Engineering Department. That was one reason why the *atchkat* under practically every tank was at present much more than could be served by the tank concerned.

Secondly, with regard to accumulation of silt, the speaker was afraid that if the waste weirs were raised, the *atchkat* lands would be submerged and Government would have to compensate the owners for their loss. The better course for Government to follow therefore appeared to be to decide how much exactly of the existing *atchkat* under each tank could be cultivated and allow only so much of it to be cultivated with the help of water from that tank. He also stated that if certain kinds of trees, like honge, date, etc., were grown on the tank-bed, they would prevent silt accumulation. If that was not possible, the Government would have to acquire some lands and raise the waste weirs. One of these alternatives should be preferred, and the raiyats assured of regular supply of water for all their lands on which wet assessment was paid.

The PRESIDENT stated that Government fully sympathised with this resolution and would accept it.

The resolution was accepted.

Resolution No. 22.

System of Joint Electorates.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA moved the following resolution:—

"This Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that the system of joint electorates be adopted in the coming political reforms in the Mysore State."

He thanked the President for having permitted him to move this resolution which was very important to the future interests of the State. According to the system that was in vogue for the past 50 years, to whatever community or religion the subjects of the State belonged, they had one common election and they all united in voting for candidates. Thus, Hindus, Mussalmans and Christians were practically participating in joint elections and that was a good fortune of the Mysore State. In British India, joint electorates had not yet come into existence. Consequently communal bickerings were in evidence as between Hindus and Mussalmans, and that was the misfortune of India. In Travancore also Hindus and Mussalmans had a joint electorate of one type. Even in Hyderabad, though distinctions were made as between Hindus and Mussalmans, His Exalted Highness the Nizam had set an ideal lesson to the rest of India by ordering joint electorates for the two great communities. In Kashmir, ever since separate electorates were instituted in pursuance of the recommendations of the Glancy Commission, differences between the communities had become acute. To avoid such a position in Mysore, the

speaker hoped that joint electorates alone would be perpetuated. That was the main object of the resolution under discussion. The taxes and cesses levied in Mysore were not levied on any communal basis. The scale of salaries to the employees of Government were not fixed on communal considerations. The subjects of Mysore did not want communal considerations to prevail in the State on any account. The interests of the country as a whole was their common concern. Hindus and Muslims in the State lived like brothers. Dr. Moonje himself, the President of the Hindu Maha Sabha, had observed that the present Muslim Dewan of this Hindu State was conducting himself in an admirable manner, free from communal bias of any kind. That being so, it was very easy for a joint electorate to work in the State. If it could not be worked successfully in Mysore, then it could be worked nowhere else in India. Mutual respect and religious toleration was a common feature of Mysore History. As Sri Ramakrishna Paramahamsa had proclaimed, all religions led but to one God, and Hindus and Muslims of Mysore were firm believers in that great Truth. That being so, the Muslims, though they were in a minority, need have no reason to fear that politically their interests would suffer if they agreed to a joint electorate.

If the general principle of joint electorates was agreed to, the speaker proceeded to suggest that either the Mahomed Ali formula or the scheme which was in force in Travancore might be adopted in Mysore also. According to the scheme followed in Travancore, if there were 300 Hindu voters and 100 Muslim voters, they voted together, and whichever candidate—Hindu or Muslim—got 60 per cent of the Muslim votes, was declared elected. The Muslims of the State had already agreed to that scheme. If for any reason that scheme did not appeal itself, he would suggest yet another alternative, *viz.*, the method of optional joint electorate, *i.e.*, voting together on all occasions except when the voters belonging to any of the communities thought it necessary to vote for candidates belonging to that community only. Under such a practice, if a majority of the Muslim voters exercised their votes in favour of Muslim candidates only on a particular occasion, at other times they would vote with the Hindus. If they did not agree to any of the foregoing alternatives and insisted only on separate electorates, then differences and dissensions, so often heard of in British India, were sure to crop up in Mysore also.

Having said this, the speaker added that in suggesting joint electorates he was not opposed to due safeguards being given to the minorities in order to allay their fears. What those safeguards were to be was a matter of detail and could be gone into by the Government later on. So far as the general question was concerned, he hoped that the House would see that one of the alternatives suggested above would do good to all the interests concerned and would, for that reason, pass the resolution unanimously.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMY IYER opposed the resolution. He was at a loss to know whether the Reform Committee themselves had favoured joint or separate electorates, and what necessity there was for Mr. Bhupalam R. Chandrasekharayya, who was himself a member of that committee, to move this resolution before the Assembly.

The PRESIDENT suggested that the mover of the resolution might explain to the House the relevant recommendation of the committee.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA stated that the committee had not recommended anything definite, beyond saying that if Muslim voters liked to have separate electorates they might do so. The object being that Muslims should not have any misgivings in the matter, any definite recommendation was not considered desirable.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMY IYER stated that there were any number of castes and communities in the State, and if joint electorates were instituted, the backward communities and particularly the minorities might go without any representation whatever. There might be intelligent men among such

communities who were anxious to serve on the public bodies, but might not get chances of doing so under the system of joint electorates. The mover had referred to Mussalmans only. But there were many other communities with a large population and yet were not adequately represented in the Assembly or the Council. That being so, the speaker would favour joint electorates provided Government would have power to nominate representatives of all those communities and interests which could not secure representation in the general elections. But if the mover of the resolution wanted joint electorates without the Government having power to nominate representatives of particular communities or interests, the speaker could not agree to such a proposal.

The speaker then referred to the question of qualification of voters and remarked that the mover had not said anything about it.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA replied that the qualifications had been proposed to be reduced substantially, *viz.*, payment of an assessment of Rs. 10 instead of Rs. 25 as before, and S.S.L.C. instead of B.A.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMY IYER did not think that that was enough and was of opinion that anybody who had completed the Middle School course must be deemed to be qualified to vote.

The PRESIDENT remarked that this point was not covered by the resolution under discussion.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMY IYER concluded by saying that he was in favour of joint electorates, subject to the Government having power to make nominations to the extent necessary.

Mr. H. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO stated that the reason why joint electorates were proposed was that the entire State should be one political unit and not be divided and sub-divided as in British India. Separate electorates in British India had created cleavage of interests. There was no such cleavage at present in Mysore as between Hindus and Muslims, but the same would come about if the system of separate electorates was introduced. There was no reason to think that the interests of the minority communities would suffer if joint electorates were continued. On the other hand, joint electorates would be in the interests of all the communities concerned. Under the benevolent rule of His Highness the Maharaja the relations among the several communities were very cordial, and would remain such in future also. All the same, the speaker agreed that adequate safeguards might be given for such of the minority communities as needed them.

Mr. TIPPU SULTAN ALI KHAN generally subscribed to the idea of keeping up joint electorates, and pointed out that joint electorates would help to preserve the identity of interest subsisting among the several communities.

But joint electorates implied that every voter must realize his responsibility and discharge it. He must, for example, be prepared to take up any duty which the country might expect him to take up. The case at present in Mysore, as in other parts of India in general, was that while everybody was anxious to exercise power, very few were prepared to undertake responsibility under such circumstances. If joint electorate alone was prescribed, it would be like putting the cart before the horse. About 75 per cent of those who had volunteered their services in connection with the present war happened to be Muslims. He could not understand why a soldier who was prepared to lose his life if necessary in the cause of his mother country should be treated as no better than anybody else. From this point of view, he feared that the question of joint electorates could not be pressed so long as the average voter was not prepared to take up responsibilities consistent with the power which he was anxious to exercise.

Mr. A. J. KHALEEL spoke as follows :—

Sir, I did not think that my friend Mr. Bhupalam Chandrasekharayya would press this resolution even though it is 22nd in the order of resolutions. The particular insistence of a particular brand of people who belong to a particular school of thought is making us more apprehensive and we feel that this is not going to be a good thing for the

Muslim community; and more so, our experience in the past and the bitter feeling which we have got compels us to say that we are not going to accept joint electorates. My friend said that in Mysore State the system of separate electorates would prove a failure. I beg to differ from him and am prepared to show by facts and figures that the system of joint electorates has proved a miserable failure so far as Mysore is concerned. If it were a success, there would not have been any necessity for the Government to go in search of candidates and nominate them for three years either for the Assembly or for the Council. That very fact shows that the system of joint electorates has proved a failure. If some more examples are needed, I am prepared to say that those people who stood up for joint electorates have fared miserably even in the matter of municipalities wherein important questions come up for discussion.

Mr. PRESIDENT.—I believe he meant joint electorates with reservation of seats.

Mr. A. J. KHALEEL.—In these days of democracy, why not Muslims go to the doctor whom they want when they have ache in their stomachs? Why should others voice forth their feelings in this Assembly? If my friends think that the particular brand of people should come to represent the Muslims, I have no objection, but that will not be democracy. What we Muslims say is, our case will be put before you by the chosen representatives who come from the Muslim side. Now, unfortunately in India, we are thinking of nationalism and democracy. Unfortunately, both these things are not good for India. We have got a religious majority which is going to be in the majority always. In other countries, it is not so. If Labour is in the majority to-day, Conservatives will be in the majority tomorrow. Some others will have their own day. Unfortunately in India, we are doomed to be a minority for all time to come. My learned friend was very eloquent when he gave the example of Hyderabad and said that joint electorate had come to stay there and that it should be so here also. He omitted to say that the system in vogue in Hyderabad is restricted to the extent of 50 per cent in the case of Mussalmans and 50 per cent in the case of Hindus. How it will work, is a matter which remains to be seen. As regards the popular Governments which have come to power elsewhere in India, I had not proposed to say anything to-day. But much against my will my friend has compelled me to do so, and I do so, however odious it may be, just to show how the Muslims are apprehensive. Eighteen months of experience of the Muslim has shown that the popular group which went to office with beat of drums and so much of praise that they were going to benefit India as a whole, have failed to do so, as far as Muslims are concerned. We need not go far. If we only take the example of the United Provinces Government, every alternate day they are bringing the army with loaded guns to march Muslims to jails and shoot them like birds. That is the experience we have got and when the Muslims appealed to them to take them to the legislature and give them their due share of representation, they were told that unless they joined the other group and belonged to their creed, wear the clothes that they wore, had the brain which they possessed and ate the menu which they gave, they were not going to touch them with a pair of tongs. That is the treatment given to Muslims who are no less patriotic than others. Our experience has shown that if we want to join them we must join them on their own terms and not as equal partners. That being the case, Muslims cannot be compelled to have a particular system of thinking, a particular menu, etc. The Congress people have failed to have Muslims in their company. They have chosen that back-door to dominate the Muslim community and annihilate their civilisation and culture. First of all they are catching hold of children and giving them education as they want. Particular brand of text-books have been introduced which are quite foreign to Muslim culture and civilisation. They have been telling them stories of Rama, Saraswati, Lakshmi and so on and nothing about Mohamed and the other Heroes of Islam. That is, whenever things have been

given to Mohamedan boys, they have been given in a Hinduised way. We are apprehensive that if they are given that sort of education, they will not be Muslims any longer. We being born Muslims want to be Muslims always. Let it be known, even though that may mean so much odium against our name, that we are determined to be Muslims. We are not afraid of that. Such being the case, to have this domination now, in the chaos of nationalism, the Muslim community is not prepared.

A question may be asked whether the present Government which has served the people and ruled over it has not saved our interests also. For that, there is only one answer: there is one person who is responsible for the safety and culture of our people. We always look to His Highness the Maharaja, who is the custodian of our rights and liberties, to safeguard our rights and interests. We must acknowledge in this House that our rights and liberties have been very safe and secure in his hands till now. Whatever is proposed to be done now, power should not be taken away from his hands. We want to see that power is in his own hands. We do not want that it should be given to this particular brand of people whose ambitions and ideals are to bring Rama Rajya or something else which they have got in view. That particular brand of Rama Rajya which they have got in mind will be Rama Rajya only for the Hindus and nothing for the Muslims, because Muslims do not belong to their group. We cannot be dominated and we look to the Government to safeguard our interests. I expect Mr. Bhupalam Chandrasekharayya, who was on the Reforms Committee, and who knows the discussions, to know the Muslim attitude on this question. The Muslim representatives who were on the committee were unanimous in this decision. I beg to voice forth the Muslim feeling, now and here, that anything done to take away separate electorates from the Muslims and force joint electorates upon them will be a cruelty which they crave the Government not to impose, listening to these people. If this matter is put to vote, except a handful of people, who belong to the majority community and have broad sympathies, I am sure the rest of the House will not vote with me. I may send my representatives by means of separate electorates, but they being in the minority, cannot influence this House at all. What I want is that Muslim representatives that come here must be Muslims and they must voice forth Muslim feelings even though they cannot influence this House. They will never influence this House, I know, but at least let Muslim opinion be voiced in this House. That being the case, I submit that the Government will not listen to other people. I appeal to the House also to have sympathies with us. We are in a minority. I expect their sympathies. We are prepared always to co-operate with them and to help them. And we in turn require their help and, I am sure, when the Muslims will no longer have the apprehensions which they have got and when the majority community behaves in such a way as to disarm them of their fears, the Muslim community will itself come forward and say: "We have enjoyed this right so far and we now feel that it is not good for us to have separate electorates. We will join you and work hand in hand." Till a sense of security is given to us, the insistence of the other side to force these things down our throats, however unwilling we are to gulp it, shows the anxiety on the other side. We fear that this anxiety is for a particular purpose. I appeal to the majority community and to the Government not to leave the minority of Muslims in the lurch or to throw us at the mercy of those forces which are always hostile to us. The one fact that we have not joined the Congress shows that we do not like them and we do not agree with them. Until our leaders are satisfied about the majority community and until we are satisfied that proper justice will be done, the request contained in this resolution should never be entertained.

Mr. ABDUL RASOOL SAB agreed that the object of the resolution was to improve the cordiality subsisting between Hindus and Muslims. Even as matters stood in the villages, if a

Hindu candidate was known to a Muslim voter, the latter would vote for the former. So the two communities were willing to co-operate with each other. But one could not always be sure that that would be the case. So, some special steps were necessary to see that the interests of all the communities were secured. One such step was to provide for separate electorates. Muslims would be satisfied with whatever reforms were granted, but the speaker was of opinion that his community would be helped very much if a separate electorate was granted to it.

Mr. Bailam SRINIVASA RAO observed that in the course of speeches made on the previous days in the Assembly, Muslim members appeared to be proud of being subjects of Mysore which was "Rama Rajya," but on the present occasion, somehow, they were apprehending that dangers and difficulties would result if joint electorate was granted. The speaker could not understand why this should be so. People felt that they were Mysoreans first and Hindus or Muslims next. There were no differences as between the two great communities at present and he hoped that differences would not be created, afresh by saying that danger lay ahead or anything of the kind. He therefore requested the House to favour joint electorates, with reservation of seats or any other kind of safeguard which the Muslims wanted.

Mr. J. ASWATHANARAYANA RAO discussed the pros and cons of joint electorates as opposed to separate electorates and expressed the opinion that under the present circumstances joint electorates, though desirable in the bare abstract, would in practice do more harm than good to the minority communities and he could appreciate the apprehensions expressed by some of the previous speakers to this effect. He did not believe that nominations, as suggested by Mr. Y. V. Muniswamy Iyer could make up for the unpleasant effects of joint electorates. In fact, nominations were not desirable at all. So the whole question was debatable and required to be examined with very great care and caution. In this view the speaker opposed the resolution, having regard to present circumstances. Later on, however, when conditions warranted, and there was a fuller awakening on the part of the voters, the question of introducing joint electorates might be considered.

Mr. H. K. MADIAH said that many members belonging to the minority and backward communities were holding responsible posts like those of District Board Presidents, etc., and as such it would not be correct to say that any interest would suffer at the hands of the majority communities if joint electorates were continued. The speaker therefore requested the House to adopt the resolution unanimously.

Mr. S. RAMAPPA also supported the resolution. He did not think that Mr. A. J. Khaleel who opposed the resolution in the course of a very long speech had adduced any convincing reasons in support of the stand he took. The only point which that member had sought to make out was that members of the minority community were not being treated properly, that they had no confidence in the deeds and intentions of the members of the majority community, and that therefore they did not want joint electorates. The speaker was at a loss to know what the majority community had done to deserve such stringent remarks at the hands of any member. Personally the speaker felt that joint electorates with reservation of seats would fully secure the interests of the minority communities. And, as the mover himself had suggested, if the Muslims preferred to have any special safeguards, they might certainly have them. The most important point was that good understanding between the two great communities should be kept up, and with that object in view, it was desirable to have only a joint electorate.

Mr. A. N. RAMA RAO further supported the resolution. Replying to Mr. Khaleel's argument in favour of separate electorates, he said that people must forget that they were Hindus or Muslims and develop the feeling that they all belonged to one and the same State. Regarding the objection that

only stories of Rama, Sita, etc., were being taught in the schools even to Muslim boys and nothing about Prophet Mahomed or about Islam, the speaker stated that it was done with no religious motives and that those lessons were considered to be of high educative value. As regards want of goodwill between the two great communities, as alleged by Mr. Khaleel, the speaker pointed out that in district boards and municipal elections, even from constituencies in which Hindus were in a majority, some Muslim candidates had been elected in preference to others. Such being the case, it was difficult to understand why anybody should be so narrow-minded as to support the system of separate electorates in the Model State of Mysore. Mr. Aswathanarayana Rao's reasoning, the speaker remarked, that separate electorates should be introduced in the case of Muslims because there was not sufficient awakening on the part of the voters, was not very sound, because whether the electorate was going to be joint or separate, the voters were the same in points of literacy. The speaker would impress on every member of the House including Mr. Khaleel that in Mysore State, Hindus and Muslims should conduct themselves like brothers and not create differences or give room for trouble of any kind. Another member had said that minority communities' interests would suffer if separate electorates were not given. If that was to be conceded as a general proposition, every minority community would have to have an electorate of its own. All things considerered, general electorate would be for the good of the State. And so far as the Government were concerned, he would appeal to them not to create separate electorates, which would certainly result in a cleavage of interests later on.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA, who spoke next, said that after listening to the various speeches on this resolution, he was convinced, more than ever before, that joint electorates would promote the best interests of all concerned. He was of opinion that Mr. Abdul Rasool Sab, who had protested on behalf of Mussalmans against joint electorates, seemed to have overlooked the fact that he himself had been returned to the Assembly by a joint electorate. This very same gentleman was the author of a representation for making Kannada a compulsory subject of study in all Urdu middle schools, as conducive to harmony between Hindus and Mussalmans. A member with such generous impulses ought not to oppose joint electorates. The speaker also felt that the apprehensions voiced by Mr. Khaleel on behalf of minority communities were unfounded. The recent presidential election in the Bangalore District Board, for instance, was an event which gave the lie direct to the apprehensions imagined by him. In that election, 24 members of the District Board whose total strength was about 30, voted in favour of Mr. Abdur Rahmon and in preference to his rival who was a Hindu. That same candidate had occupied the presidential chair of the district board for a continuous period of 8 years formerly. Taking the case of the Bangalore City Municipal Council, he said that Mr. Razvi, a Muslim member, was being elected successively. Mr. Balakrishnaiya, the present President of the Council, was a member of a minority community. Mr. D. Venkataramanappa, its Vice-President, was a member of a very small minority community. The cases of Mr. V. Venkataswami Chetty, President, and Mr. S. Ramappa, Vice-President of the Kolar District Board, were similar in character. All these clearly showed that there was no substance either in the apprehension about securing representation for minority communities or in the laboured arguments of Mr. Khaleel. Minority communities had sufficient safeguards such as the guarantee of a definite number of seats to them in the constitutional Houses of the State. Under this rule, if a sufficient number of representatives of those communities were not returned in the general elections, the difference would be made up by the nomination of the most popular members. If any further sefeguards were found necessary, it was easy to devise them. Meanwhile, the main object of this resolution being that good relationship

between the majority and minority communities should subsist and that there should be no scope for any cleavage of interests, it was up to every well-meaning citizen of the State to press for a system of joint electorates. He therefore appealed to the House to adopt without division the resolution under discussion.

Mr. MIR MAHOMED HUSSAIN subscribed to the arguments advanced by the mover in favour of joint electorates and added that the danger of separate electorates was that they would foster separatist tendencies among the minority communities. Speaking of the present, it was a happy augury that the two important communities in the State, *viz.*, Hindus and Mussalmans, were getting on harmoniously, especially in the villages, and Mussalmans in particular were largely dependent on the cooperation of the Hindus for various things. The introduction of separate electorates might disturb that harmony and create a cleavage of interests, thereby affecting the well-being of the Muslim community, especially in interior parts of the State. He therefore had great pleasure in supporting the resolution.

Mr. SYED MOHIYUDDIN HUSSAIN, on the other hand, opposed the resolution. He did not believe that the instances quoted by Mr. Byanna were such as to support the argument that because some members of minority communities were returned by a joint electorate, there should be no separate electorates at all. And as regards the election of Mr. Abdur Rahmon to the presidentship of the Bangalore District Board, it had been made possible under a very peculiar circumstance, *viz.*, that there was very keen competition as between two Hindu candidates and a third candidate who was not a Hindu got the benefit of it. But for that rivalry, he was sure that a Mussalman would not have had a chance for election. He was saying this from his own experience. Some years ago, in connection with elections to certain local bodies, he had the bitter experience that some of his own men had been ranged against him by a rival candidate who was a Hindu. He could cite several such instances. That was why he was in favour of separate electorates. And after all, he was at a loss to know why anybody should bother himself about the Mussalmans who would ask the Government for what they wanted. So long as no harm was caused to other communities by Mussalmans being given separate electorates, he did not think that any other community need worry about it. He was definitely in favour of separate electorates for his community.

On a point of personal explanation, **Mr. M. ABDUL RASOOL SAB** narrated the circumstances under which he had been able to secure a seat in the Assembly. The Congress members having resigned, bye-elections were notified. But in the peculiar circumstances of the situation, people were afraid to stand for election, and the speaker was induced to stand and give a lead to others. This he did and it was because of want of competitors that he was returned to the Assembly unopposed.

Mr. Yajaman N. Y. VEERABHADRACHAR said that as against the examples cited by the two previous Muslim speakers, he was aware of any number of cases of Mussalman candidates having been returned by joint electorates. He was afraid that by attaching value to arguments like those advanced by certain members who supported separate electorates, the Government themselves would be creating splits and separatist tendencies. He appealed to the Government not to do so but to say that all communities in the State should try to secure representation through general elections or any special safeguards which Government might provide in the case of particular interests.

Mr. A. VENKATESAIYA said that while listening to the speech of Mr. A. J. Khaleel and the arguments he advanced in support of separate electorates, he was reminded of a saying: "The surface is rugged; but, remember, he has a soul!" He was surprised that some other members, also seemed to entertain doubts and fears about joint electorates. One member had asked why any Non-Muslim should bother himself if the Muslims wanted from

Government certain safeguards or facilities without affecting the interests of others. And Mr. Khaleel himself had expressed a number of apprehensions that unless separate electorates were given, the interests of Muslims were going to be sacrificed. He assured the House there was no cause for any such apprehensions or doubts. Everybody was quite prepared and willing to provide necessary safeguards for the Muslims as well as to other minority communities. But his contention was that subject to such safeguards, there should be joint electorates. Under safeguards a definite number of seats could be guaranteed to the minorities in the Houses of Legislature, the representatives being chosen from urban areas only for some of the seats and from rural areas only for the remaining seats. Thus all fears and doubts about the inadequacy of representation of minority communities or of rural areas would be set at rest.

The second reason adduced in favour of separate electorates was that under existing conditions, Muslim pupils were being trained in Hindu atmosphere and that the text-books prescribed for them dealt with Hindu deities like Rama, Sita and Lakshmi. The speaker wondered whether there was any harm in learning something of the great men of old, something of the lives which would place high ideals before those who were to be the future citizens of the State. Rather than object to it, one ought to welcome that kind of education. He was convinced that if only every Hindu, every Mussalman and every Depressed Class member realized one great philosophical truth, *viz.*, that everybody had a soul and that it required to be stirred on healthy lines, all differences of opinion would melt away.

Proceeding to dwell on the harm that would be wrought by a system of separate electorates, he observed that clash of interests was sure to follow. It ought to be the aim of every community to make common cause with all the other people and maintain a spirit of true *comraderie*. He regretted that Mr. Khaleel should have tried to mix up religion with politics and clouded the issue. He only hoped that other Muslim members would not share the views of that member and bring about an estrangement between two important communities in the State.

In concluding his remarks, he observed that a true patriot could never be sectarian in spirit or outlook and that, even though such a patriot happened to be a Non-Muslim, he was sure to be loved by all, including Mussalmans; whereas a bad Muslim would not be liked even by Musslmans themselves. The speaker claimed that out of a Muslim population of 17,000 in the Mysore City, he was very well acquainted with 12,000 or 13,000 Mussalmans and enjoyed their confidence; and with the benefit of his experience of them he could say that the Muslim masses were not swayed in political matters by communal considerations at all. He therefore hoped that the bulk of the Muslim members of the House would support joint electorates as suggested in the resolution.

Mr. ABDUL NABI KHAN supported the resolution. He said that he was being returned to the Assembly for 15 or 20 years from a general constituency under the system of joint electorates. He owed his votes mostly to Hindus. It might be that in big cities, separate electorates were welcomed by Muslims. But the case was quite the reverse in the mofussils. Even if separate electorates were given, it would not be possible for the candidates to benefit by them. For instance, it might not be feasible for every candidate to tour the entire district and approach all the Muslim voters. That would mean heavy expenditure which barely any Muslim candidate could afford to incur. At least, under the existing system, there was scope for nomination by Government to the extent necessary with a view to making up the deficiency in the number of seats secured in general elections, whereas under a system of separate electorates, that scope might disappear. Besides, separate electorates would generate a spirit of rivalry among the various candidates of one and the same community, resulting sometimes in dissensions, disturbances and damage.

If at all, separate electorates could be tried with advantage only in provinces where Muslims were in a majority, but it would be harmful to their best interests in all other provinces. He was sure that the Muslim community in Mysore as such was not enamoured of separate electorates, for the simple reason that they could not get on without the goodwill of the Hindus. The two communities were now pulling on amicably like members of one family and he wished that they should continue to do so in future also. For this reason, he was not in favour of any innovations like the inauguration of separate electorates.

At this stage, **Mr. A. J. KHALEEL** wanted to answer some of the points raised by the previous speaker with reference to his speech on the resolution.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA objected to it on the ground that no member except the mover had a right of reply.

The PRESIDENT upheld the objection but would allow Mr. Khaleel to have his say, if any, in reply to the point raised by two Muslim members to the effect that joint electorates alone would be helpful to Muslims.

Mr. KHALEEL referred to Mr. A. Venkatesaiya's remark that everybody had a soul and therefore deserved sympathy, and observed that caste Hindus who believed in that need not have taken 20 centuries to realize that the Harijan also had a soul. And he expressed the fear that it might take several centuries more for them to realize that the Muslim too had a soul. As a matter of fact, he was of opinion that in the mofussil parts, the only persons who really counted with the Hindu voters were lawyers, physicians, etc., who were mostly Hindus and not Mussalmans.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that none-the-less the fact remained that Muslim members like Mr. Nabi Khan were actually being returned by a joint electorate.

Mr. A. J. KHALEEL replied that he was talking of Muslims in general. He was keen that there should be reserved seats, to be filled by the most popular representatives of the community concerned, and that would be possible only under a system of separate electorates composed of voters of the same community.

Mr. Shampoor PAPANNA said that the controversy about separate electorates as opposed to general electorates was of recent origin in this country and that the generality of people had not understood the question in all its aspects. Several enlightened persons held the view that the system of separate electorates was harmful to the cause of the country as it would retard the development of a sense of common citizenship and act prejudicially to the best interests of the minority communities themselves. The main reason why certain people insisted upon separate electorates seemed to lie in the fact that religious questions were being dragged in while disposing of political matters also. The speaker was, however, of the opinion that the two points were entirely unconnected with each other and should not be mixed up. So far as the interests of minority communities were concerned, they could be properly safeguarded by reservation of seats, and the representatives of the minorities might get returned to such seats by joint electorates. In this view, he supported a system of joint electorates with reservation of seats.

Mr. MIR MAHOMED SAB said that the system of separate electorates would not be peculiar to Mysore nor was it a new question as separate electorates were in vogue in the neighbouring province of Madras and some North Indian provinces. He was afraid that even by making nominations, the Government might not be able to equalise representation for the Muslims nor was there much chance of Muslims being returned by general constituencies. If, however, the Government could assure the House that they would make nominations to the extent necessary for giving the Muslim community its proper share of representation, he would agree to joint electorates. Otherwise, he would suggest that whatever system was followed in Madras might be adopted in Mysore also.

Mr. MIR MAHOMED HUSSAIN was of the opinion that separate electorates would affect prejudicially the interests of Muslims residing in the villages, foster a separatist tendency, and tempt the Muslims and other communities in course of time to demand separate trains, separate high schools and separate colleges, etc., which would be suicidal to them in the long run. He was therefore definitely opposed to separate electorates, and supported the resolution.

Mr. D. VENKATARAMANAPPA also supported the resolution. He observed that Mysore was totally free from Hindu-Muslim differences, but the introduction of separate electorates might create a cleavage between the two communities. He believed that there would be no difficulty in the way of Muslim candidates being returned to public bodies through a joint electorate. There was no force in the argument advanced by a previous speaker that the election of Mr Abdur Rahmon to the presidentship of the Bangalore District Board was made possible only by rivalry between two Hindu candidates; because, that very same gentleman had been elected as President on several occasions previously also. The fact was that in the case of a competent and popular candidate, the question of religion or community would never arise. If once the principle of separate electorates was accepted in the case of a single community like the Muslim, the speaker feared that every other minority community would lay claim to a similar concession and that would result in a separatist tendency showing itself in every branch of public life in the State. He appealed to his Muslim colleagues in the House not to exhibit such a tendency so long as they could rest assured that their interests would be adequately safeguarded by means of reservation of seats. The speaker himself belonged to a minority community and was nominated to the Assembly only once; subsequently, however, he had found no difficulty in getting returned by a joint electorate for the past 16 years continuously. This, in his opinion, showed clearly that there was no basis for the apprehension entertained that a joint electorate would adversely affect the interests of any minority community.

Mr. M. ABDUL JABBAR, by way of correcting certain statements of the previous speaker, pointed out that Mr. Abdur Rahmon's election to the District Board was possible because he had stood from the V Division where 40 per cent of the voters were Muslims, and not with the help of the Hindu votes. Mr. Razvi had been elected to the municipal council as a congressman and not as a Mussalman. He reinforced his contention by pointing out that though there were 30 seats on the Bangalore City Municipal Council, not a single Muslim member had been returned so far in the general election.

The PRESIDENT observed that if there was to be reservation of seats, the Muslims need have no apprehensions.

Mr. ABDUL JABBAR replied that even then only those Muslims who were one with the Hindu voters could get in through the joint electorate. No one could get in as a representative of Muslim interests. He added that he had known of cases in which Hindu candidates had told their voters in the villages that as true Hindus, they must vote only for candidates of their own community.

The PRESIDENT observed that that was not right.

Mr. ABDUL JABBAR stated that it was for that very reason that the Mussalmans felt that their interests should be safeguarded by means of a separate electorate.

The PRESIDENT remarked that nobody could lose sight of the fact that certain enlightened Mussalmans themselves were not in favour of that system.

Mr. HUSSAIN ALI BEIG stated that in Mysore, Hindus were in a large majority and Muslims formed a minority. It was therefore necessary for the Muslims to get on well with the Hindus. The Government also should try to promote harmony between the two communities. According to the Quoran, there was only one God, and all people, irrespective of the religion they professed, were children

of the same God. All divisions like castes and communities were artificial creations devised by man for meeting selfish ends. He was so happy to see that a majority of people—both Hindus and Mussalmans—realized this and he could assert from personal experience that there was perfect communal harmony in the villages. He himself had been returned to the Assembly by 900 Hindu votes, there being barely 41 Muslim voters in his constituency, and in preference to his rival who was a Hindu and a wealthy man and law graduate. That, he said, showed that any candidate, irrespective of his religion, could get elected through the joint electorate, provided he gained the confidence of the voters by dint of honest service. And even granting for the purpose of argument that a Muslim was not elected, it would not matter very much; so long as each important interest was duly represented, it was immaterial whether its representative was a Hindu or a Mussalman or an Adikarnataka.

Mr. Khaji SYED YUSUF SAHIB referred to a widespread apprehension on the part of certain Muslim members that Muslim candidates could not ordinarily get elected through joint electorates and that, notwithstanding the reservation of seats for Muslims, only those who were friends of Hindu voters could hope to succeed. In order to set at rest this apprehension, he made for the consideration of the House a suggestion that in addition to reserved seats, the Muslims be given some special weightage to the extent of at least 25 per cent of the seats. According to this suggestion, the Muslim candidates who polled 50 per cent or more of the votes would have to be declared elected first to the reserved seats and the other candidates declared elected to the remaining seats on the basis of the largest number of the votes polled. If the House would concede both the points in favour of the Muslim minority, he hoped that his co-religionists including those who had spoken against the resolution, might vote in favour of joint electorates.

Continuing, he observed that joint electorates with reservation of seats was always preferable to separate electorates because, in British India where separate electorates were in existence, the candidates elected by them were always complaining that the majority communities were not helping them within the Houses of Legislature. Without the help of others, the representatives of minority communities could not establish their rights at all. From that point of view, he was always of the opinion that a scheme like the one suggested above would be in the best interests of all concerned.

ANOTHER MUSLIM MEMBER (who spoke in Urdu) was of opinion that the Muslim members who had advocated joint electorates for their community were persons who had never contested in a general election. From personal experience, he thought that the interests of Muslims could be safeguarded only under a system of separate electorates with reservation of seats. He therefore opposed the resolution.

Rao Sahib M. RAMASWAMI, on the other hand, spoke in support of the resolution. He considered this the most opportune time for the Assembly to demonstrate to the world at large the breadth of its vision, especially as the British Indian Provinces and the sister states were watching anxiously the nature of the constitutional reforms that were about to be announced by the Government of Mysore. He appealed to all sections of the House to remember that in Mysore the relations between Hindus and Muslims were most cordial and that nothing should be done to mar such relations. But as evidenced by certain speeches of Muslim members, a sort of suspicion and fear were lurking in the minds of Muslims about the attitude of the majority communities. If the cause for such an apprehension was removed and requisite confidence created in them, he had no doubt that the Muslims would willingly vote for joint electorates. But that could be done only by generosity on the part of Hindus. Reservation of seats for Muslims would be one evidence of such generosity. One or two Muslim members had asked for weightage in addition to reservation. The speaker was of opinion that that

question deserved the earnest consideration of all sections of the House. Pending the disposal of that question, he appealed to the Muslims to reciprocate the good-will of the House by accepting the principle of joint electorates as that alone would preserve brotherly feelings between the two communities. It might be that the Muslim candidates actually returned during the first few elections might not be considered as true representatives of the community. Even then, there was no reason to fear that such candidates would do anything to harm the interests of Muslims. If the candidates desired by the Muslims were not elected, it might be due to the fact that Muslim voters themselves were not impressed by the merits of such candidates. However that be, Muslims as a community might have full confidence in the sense of justice of His Highness the Maharaja and his Government; and so long as such confidence existed, he thought that elections should take place under a system of joint electorates so that the Muslim candidates might have to depend upon Hindu votes and the Hindu candidates upon Muslim votes, thereby making the constitutional assemblies more and more democratic in character. The speaker had no sympathy for separate electorates as they would make for separatism on the part of the minority communities.

Mr. MIRZA AZEEZULLA BEIG remarked that he was unable to compliment the mover on having brought forward this resolution. The subject-matter of the resolution had been included in the terms of reference to the Reforms Committee; it was discussed in full by that committee and according to the mover himself, there was no unanimity of opinion among the committee members, with the result that the committee had to leave the question to be decided in whatever manner was considered best by the Government. So far as he was aware, many Muslim bodies which could speak with authority on the subject, had sent up their memoranda to Government, and several individual Muslim representatives had also given evidence before the committee. All those witnesses were unanimous in their opinion that the seats reserved for Muslims should be filled by means of separate electorates. In a matter like this which affected the vital interests of the whole of the community, the opinion of the community concerned should prevail. Some of the Hindu members of the Assembly had appealed to their Muslim colleagues to support the resolution. Even if they supported the resolution, the speaker did not consider that 20 or 25 Muslim members of the Assembly could take the serious responsibility of compelling the entire Muslim community in Mysore to submit themselves to the implications of joint electorates. The Reforms Committee was, in his opinion, very wise in leaving it to the Government to finally decide the question. He appealed to the Government to take all aspects of the case into consideration as well as the wishes of the entire Muslim community and arrive at a decision. He also requested the Government to bear in mind, while deciding the question, that the percentage of literacy in the State was still very low and the generality of the voters were unable to exercise due discretion while exercising their franchise. It was therefore necessary that every interest was given reasonable safeguards, and separate electorates were the most important safeguard which the Muslims prayed for. Even among the Muslim members of the Assembly, he hoped that very few would favour joint electorates and that an overwhelming majority was for separate electorates.

Mr. BHAKTAR SAB observed that the arguments advanced by certain Muslim members who had advocated joint electorates looked sound enough but it would be interesting to note that not one of those members had experienced the difficulty of contesting in a general election. One of those members was a British born subject and not a Mysorean. The Congress party which was gaining in strength and influence in the State had no sympathy at all for communal electorates. Congressmen had characterised the Muslims as being responsible for India not winning

Swaraj. And since Congressmen could influence the voters, specially in the villages, it was a foregone conclusion that the villagers would never vote for Muslim candidates.

Mr. MIR MAHOMED HUSSAIN, interrupting, observed that if only the member stood for election from Goribidnur Taluk, he would secure the highest number of votes.

Mr. BHAKTAR SAB retorted that the member who had interrupted him did not know the state of affairs in some cases. He was perhaps not aware that the asses employed for carrying toddy for him only a few days before in Madhugiri Taluk, had been killed by some followers of Congress and the carcasses of the animals had been cut open. Toddy shops could not be kept open on account of picketing. Some Muslims were about to vacate their shops and even houses and go in search of peaceful places. Considering all these circumstances, and considering also the fact that even if a certain number of seats were reserved for Muslims, such seats were likely to go only to well-to-do and influential members and not to the poorer representatives, he emphasised the need for separate electorates which alone could safeguard the interests of the Muslim minority in the State.

Mr. V. VENKATASAMI CHETTY regretted the attitude of certain Muslim members in the House who had depicted the Hindu community in a dark colour betrayed a lack of confidence in the Hindu voters and pleaded for separate electorates. If once the principle of separate electorates was recognized, he was afraid that the Government would have to apply it even in the case of certain other communities like Adikarnatakas, etc. That would amount to introducing an impracticable element in the matter of elections. As a matter of practical politics and in the interest of good understanding between the two great communities, he appealed to the Muslim members of the House to support the system of joint electorates.

Mr. K. MUNIVENKATAPPA emphasized that minority communities would be subjected to untold hardships if they were made to secure representation through joint electorates, for the reason that the majority community had no sympathy for minorities. But for the prevailing system of nomination, he said that neither he nor the other friends representing minorities could have secured seats in the Assembly and other public bodies. He apprehended that if the system of joint electorates should be perpetuated, the minorities would have no political salvation.

Mr. JATHARE NAIK said that the aspirations of all minority communities should be satisfied and that would be possible only under a system of separate electorates.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA, in replying to the debate on the resolution, stated that prior to the discussion by the House, he was doubting whether it was advisable to moot the question at all, but that after listening to the speeches both for and against the resolution, he was satisfied that he had really done a service to the State by bringing forward the resolution. He was not surprised that there was some difference of opinion as to the advisability of minority communities participating in joint electorates. As a matter of fact, that very question was the subject-matter of a controversy not only in Mysore but outside. But in disposing of the question with reference to any particular country or state, it was necessary to take into consideration the effect of the decision to be arrived at, in view of the various religious denominations of the people inhabiting the country or state. The speaker was of opinion that it was only when there was perfect harmony and co operation among all sections of the people that the interests of every one of those sections could be safeguarded. Otherwise he was afraid that, as in Russia and Germany, everything concerning religion would come to be relegated to the background and neither Hinduism nor Islam nor any other religion would be safe. The Government too would not be justified in fostering a spirit of separatism on the part of any community, as that would result in mutual distrust among the important

communities in the country. It was in this view that separate electorates conceded to Muslims in British India under the Minto-Morley reforms were being deplored by one committee after another as being inimical to the interests of common citizenship. Even the authors of the Montford Report had declared that communal electorate would perpetuate class divisions and that its continuance was bound to act as a serious obstacle to the principle of self-government. It was evident that national unity could be secured only by joint electorates.

Having said this, the speaker added that he was very glad that members of the House had viewed this question with an open mind and discussed it on merits according to their best lights. It was true that some Muslim members had spoken in favour of the resolution while some Hindu members had expressed themselves in opposition to it. But on the whole, the resolution had received the support of the House and for this he was thankful to the members.

The speaker then referred to the suggestion made by a few of the earlier Muslim speakers that they would agree to joint electorates provided these were accompanied by a system of nominations also. Personally he had no objection to that request being granted at all. But whether that was done or not, the very fact that the voters at Channapatna, of whom as many as 60 per cent were Muslims, had returned to the Representative Assembly a Hindu candidate (Mr. Y. V. Muniswamy Iyer) proved clearly that voters were generally influenced by the merits of the candidates and not by considerations of caste, colour or creed.

He next referred to the objections raised by Mr. A. J. Khaleel and observed that those objections merely showed that Muslim opinion was not unanimous so far as this question was concerned. That was the experience even of the Committee on Constitutional Reforms. Mr. Khaleel might have opposed the question of joint electorates as vehemently as he could. But Mr. Rahmon of Belur, for example, who was a municipal councillor for many years, a district board member and a sitting member of the Representative Assembly, had deposed before the Reforms Committee that it would be impossible for townspeople adequately to foresee the handicaps to which candidates in country parts would be subjected if the system of separate electorates was introduced, and this was the reason why that member had urged for joint electorates. Another valuable piece of evidence adduced by him, if mentioned on the present occasion, would effectively allay one particular misapprehension expressed by Mr. Khaleel, and that evidence was to the effect that Muslim candidates returned by joint electorates could be depended upon not to be hostile to the interests of Muslims in general, and that every true Mussalman would always be loyal to his community whether he was returned by joint or separate electorates. But the fact that some Muslim members had supported joint electorates and that some Hindu members had opposed them showed that this was neither a Hindu question nor a Muslim question, so that, whichever of the two systems would promote the best interests of the entire State should alone be adopted. The interests of the State, the speaker urged, should not be sacrificed with a view to benefiting any one section or community.

Referring to the importance of securing adequate representation for Muslims in the constitutional bodies, he said that such representation would be guaranteed to them under the system of reservation of seats. As regards weightage, suggested by another Muslim member, he thought that that question was not relevant to the resolution under discussion and might be left entirely to the decision of Government after considering the percentage asked for by Muslim witnesses before the Reforms Committee and also the percentage recommended by that committee. After all, what was being asked for in Mysore was responsible government under the ægis of His Highness the Maharaja who would continue to have the final voice on all important questions. In his note of dissent to the Report of the Reforms

Committee the speaker had emphasised the importance of Ministers enjoying the confidence of the legislature even in the absence of a provision for a vote of no-confidence under the new constitution. According to his scheme, whatever decision His Highness took would be final and binding on the Cabinet. It was in that spirit of loyalty that responsible government was conceived by him. That being so, his Muslim friends need have no fears whatever that their interests would be sacrificed by the majority communities under the reformed government.

As regards the allegation that the position of Muslims in the Congress-governed provinces of British India had become deplorable and that a similar fate might overtake Muslims in Mysore also if a popular government came to power, the speaker explained that circumstances in Mysore were entirely different from those elsewhere. It was not his intention to thrust joint electorates on Muslims against their wishes. The object of this resolution was merely that the Assembly might express its own view on the question even though, after a decision, either in favour of separate electorates or in favour of joint electorates was taken by His Highness the Maharaja, every subject of the State would cheerfully submit to that decision. On this understanding, it would be well if the Assembly came to some unanimous decision on the resolution. In the interests of such unanimous decision, he would even suggest a compromise, *viz.*, that the method of election be left entirely to the option of the voters in each constituency instead of deciding that separate electorates should for all time remain a permanent feature in Mysore. What he meant by that suggestion was that at one time Hindus and Muslims might be allowed to vote separately for candidates of their respective communities, but at another they might be allowed to vote jointly, regard being had, in such cases, not to the community but to the merits of the candidates or the merits of the outstanding questions requiring solution at the time, such as the Excise policy of Government, the Public Security Act, etc. He added that this particular proposal had been placed before certain prominent Muslims in British India, all of whom had welcomed it as tending to preserve the harmony between the two great communities.

In view of the opinions of eminent men of British India and of the support extended by many Muslim members of the House, the speaker appealed to those in opposition to re-consider their stand and vote in favour of the resolution. He would only ask his colleagues to remember that if the idea of separate electorates was carried to its logical conclusion, it might even tempt the reactionaries to go so far as to agitate for a separate Representative Assembly for Muslims, etc. Such a mentality would lead to most regrettable consequences and practically divide the State into two clear camps, Muslim and Hindu, as reactionaries elsewhere were actually trying to do with regard to British India. Before concluding, the speaker referred to a remark made by Mr. Tippu Sultan Ali Khan and Mr. Aswathanarayana Rao and said that he did not agree with those members in that the average voters in Mysore could not exercise their judgment properly because they were illiterate. Common-sense, he asserted, was no monopoly of literate persons. The average voter could well be trusted to use his discretion and exercise his franchise with a sense of justice and fairplay to all the interests concerned. He therefore concluded with an appeal to the House to vote solidly in favour of the resolution as that alone would do credit to the tradition and culture of Mysore and ensure the future progress of the State and the prosperity of all its subjects.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau) speaking on behalf of Government observed that, as pointed out by Rao Sahib M. Ramaswami, the present time was no doubt opportune for discussing the question: because the report of the Reforms Committee was under the active consideration of Government: and it was but natural that in any scheme of constitutional reform in modern times, the composition of the electorate was assuming

much prominence. From this point of view, the discussion that had taken place on this resolution would be of great assistance and value to the Government. The discussion had made it clear that there was keen difference of opinion as to whether joint electorates or separate electorates would suit Mysore best. As members might be aware, this very controversy was being waged in India for at least 30 or 35 years past: and in Mysore itself, the advantages and disadvantages of each system of electorate with special reference to the conditions prevailing in the State, had been discussed in sufficient detail. It seemed to be the view of some that the system of separate electorates was best suited to certain minorities. *Per contra*, there was another view held by some others that joint electorates alone would make for an identity of interest among the various communities in the State. The speaker did not wish, on the present occasion, to examine the comparative merits of those two conflicting opinions. Such examination, after all, might be of academical interest only and the question itself ultimately was bound to reduce itself to one of mutual confidence. Otherwise, if it was possible for some people to favour joint electorates out of mere sentiment, others might argue from an equally sentimental point of view that under separate electorates, men with a purely communal or partisan outlook would get returned. Personally, he thought that neither of the two systems was altogether free from defects. But there were no absolute standards by which one could decide that a particular system alone should be adopted.

The House might however pause to ascertain what the Reforms Committee themselves had to say on the question at issue. They had also stated that this question had been discussed at great length in British India, and that there was what was known as the 'Communal Award' of the Prime Minister of England, which award was later embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935. The controversy waged in British India over this question was perhaps influenced by past history and it was probable that members of the Assembly who had voiced their feelings on the present occasion were similarly influenced by the points urged in the course of that controversy. But one thing was clear, *viz.*, that the vast majority of the Muslim witnesses who appeared before the Reforms Committee had expressed themselves in favour of separate electorates. The mover of this resolution and his supporters studied the question from another point of view, and from that point of view, they were right in holding that they were already having joint electorates in Mysore, that they were helpful in promoting collective life and therefore that that system alone should continue in future also. But in matters pertaining to the interests of minority communities, where the communities themselves took a particular stand or view, he thought that it would always be best that Government accepted their view-point instead of forcing upon them other systems based upon other theories.

One member had suggested that even among the Hindus, certain minority communities should be given the benefit of separate electorates. In reply to that, the speaker stated that in the case of minorities within the Hindu fold, the question of separate electorates could never arise. Such electorates might have some justification in the case of Muslims because they had a religion and culture all their own. Indian Christians and Europeans also could be treated likewise. But so far as the Hindus were concerned, it was the opinion of the Reforms Committee that if Government went on sub-dividing them, identity of interests and harmonious relations even as between the sects would disappear for all time. Government fully shared that opinion and therefore felt that the question of separate electorates should never arise in the case of the Hindus.

On the question of nominations, Mr. Y. V. Muniswamy Iyer had emphasised the need for the retention of that system under the reformed government also. It had been recommended by the Reforms Committee as well so that experts and men of experience might be

included in the public bodies. Government fully agreed that inclusion of a few experts and men of experience was a very desirable feature and should be provided for.

Another point which the speaker wished to mention was that though the Reforms Committee had thought of separate electorates for Christians and other Non-Hindu minorities also, the recommendation had particular reference to Muslim seats. That recommendation also suggested that Government might agree to whatever system appealed most to that community. But there was no unanimity of opinion on this point even among the Muslims themselves. Some Muslim members were of opinion that townspeople might have joint electorates if they liked, but that rural constituencies ought to have only separate electorates. Again, some suggested that the voting should first be by a joint electorate and if any deficiency was noticed, that is to say, if a minimum number of seats was not secured by members of the community, then the remaining seats meant for that community should be filled up by means of election in a separate electorate. This suggestion would mean neither joint electorates nor separate electorates. He was referring to all these points merely to show that these were not questions which could be disposed of finally and definitely by abstract reasoning.

Joint electorates were in vogue in Mysore for a long time. The point for consideration now was whether it could be tried for some more time or a new system. The only object of Government was that whatever system would safeguard the interests of Muslims and whatever system would be welcomed by the community itself, might be tried.

In this connection, the speaker said that he was glad to hear from one of the earlier speakers that no minority in the State had reason to complain that its interests were in jeopardy. But he was not surprised at that acknowledgment because there was only one source of all constitutional power and authority in the State, *viz.*, His Highness the Maharaja, who could be depended upon to protect the interests of the minorities. The State was a permanent entity, ruled by a Constitutional Monarch who was a hereditary Ruler. In such circumstances, any scheme of reform could derive its final sanction only from His Highness the Maharaja.

In conclusion, **Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU** pointed out that the question of minorities was looming large everywhere in India. But even though, elsewhere in India, particular minorities might have an apprehension, rightly or wrongly, that their rights and culture were not adequately safeguarded, so far as Mysore was concerned he could assure the House, if at all such assurance was needed, that the minorities need entertain no such apprehension. After all, what mattered most was that all important minorities should be assured of adequate representation in the constitutional assemblies. And so long as such representation was assured, the particular system by which the representatives might get in was immaterial. He hoped, therefore, that the House would rest content with this assurance from Government that they would see that whatever system of election would make for the proper representation of the interests concerned and at the same time ensure harmonious relations among the different communities in the State would be adopted.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA said that he was glad to hear from Government that they would do all they could to secure the best interests of all concerned. But in order to ascertain the volume of opinion in the Assembly in favour of the question, he requested that the resolution be put to vote.

The resolution was thereupon put to vote and declared passed by a vast majority, 3 Muslim members participating in the voting and voting in favour of the resolution.

PRESIDENT'S CONCLUDING REMARKS.

Mr. C. K. VENKATARAMAIYA, Kannada Translator to Government, then

read the President's Concluding Remarks as follows :—

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

I shall not detain the House with many words in closing this Session of the Representative Assembly.

We may all look back with satisfaction on the Session. The debates throughout have been marked by good temper and a spirit of co-operation and by a feeling that Government has only one end in view—the well-being and progress of Mysore.

Mysore Public Security Act.

I was glad that the House expressed itself all but unanimously in favour of the Mysore Public Security Act. This was to be expected of men of wisdom and experience, with full knowledge of what is going on around them.

Motor Spirit Sales Taxation Bill.

With regard to the Motor Spirit Sales Taxation Bill, Government hope to defer the levy until the financial situation definitely requires the augmentation of our revenue from this source. In this connection, the possibility of avoiding an increase in the price of petrol, at a time when it is abnormally high owing to other causes, will also be kept in view.

Income-tax Amendment Bill.

It was suggested by some of the members that the higher rate of tax proposed in the Bill for amending the Income-tax Act (that is, two annas in the rupee) might be applied to companies and registered firms with incomes exceeding Rs. 4,800 per annum. Government have noted this suggestion, and will, if possible, adopt it when the Bill is placed before the Legislative Council.

I should like to refer very briefly, in passing, to some of the important matters that were raised in the course of the debates at this Session.

Appropriation of agricultural land for building purposes.

Members representing both urban and rural constituencies have brought to notice certain hardships caused to landholders by the operation of the present rules regarding the use of agricultural land for building purposes. It was stated that the rates of conversion fine were somewhat heavy, and that the practice, which has latterly come into vogue, of imposing a special assessment in such cases virtually amounted to a double levy. Government propose to examine the whole question, and see what relief, if any, can be given, having regard to the desirability of encouraging village and town extensions, but without prejudice to the right of the State to tax a part of the unearned increment accruing in such cases.

Debt Conciliation Boards.

The working of the Debt Conciliation Boards came in for some criticism. I must admit that the amount of debt so far dealt with is not very large. Government are, however, taking steps to have the working of the scheme and other allied measures for the relief of agricultural debtors investigated by a special officer, and, in the light of the results disclosed, action will be taken to place these schemes on a more satisfactory basis.

Introduction of Kannada in Urdu Schools.

The discussion on the question of introducing Kannada as a compulsory subject in Urdu schools revealed the anxiety of the Muslim representatives that their boys should acquire not merely a working knowledge of the State language, but a fair amount of proficiency in it. This was suggested partly on utilitarian grounds, but mainly as a means of enabling Muslims in the State to participate more fully in the general life of the community. The proposal is an index of the spirit of common citizenship which is so strong among all sections of His Highness the Maharaja's subjects. There may be practical difficulties in adding a new subject to the heavy curriculum of studies in Urdu schools, but the proposal merits, and will receive, very careful attention.

Broadcasting.

There is a desire on the part of the members that arrangements should be made early to establish a Broadcasting Station in the State. Broadcasting has come to take a prominent place in the life of the individual as much as of the nation. Government have already taken up the question of establishing a 5-Kilowatt Short Wave Station in this city.

Constitutional Reforms.

I feel I should tell the House that the Report of the Constitutional Reform Committee was received by Government on August 31. The minutes of dissent—and they are many and lengthy—came in much later. The Report is receiving the earnest consideration of Government, and they expect to pass orders upon it before long. I have every hope that the recommendations of the Committee and the Government Order thereon will be received with satisfaction by the country.

It is the special desire of His Highness the Maharaja that the integrity, the efficiency, and the stability of his Government should remain unimpaired, so that every section of his subjects may have the fullest confidence in it, and live without any feeling of animosity or suspicion against one another or against the Administration. That, after all, is I believe, the acid test of any constitution, and I trust that, judged by that test, the new Constitution will not be found wanting.

It only remains for me to thank the members for the work which they have done during the present Session, and to wish them God-speed.

Vote of Thanks.

MR. D. VENKATARAMANAPPA proposed a vote of thanks to the Chair.

With three cheers to His Highness the Maharaja, the Assembly was adjourned *sine die*, at 12-20 P.M.

BANGALORE,

Dated 23rd February 1940.

H. V. NARAYANA RAO,

Secretary, Mysore Representative Assembly.